



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/508,316	05/26/2000	Pierre Girard	100954-001	9687
23117	7590	07/13/2005	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			FERGUSON, LAWRENCE D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1774	
DATE MAILED: 07/13/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/508,316

Applicant(s)

GIRARD ET AL.

Examiner

Lawrence D. Ferguson

Art Unit

1774

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/28/05
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the amendment mailed March 18, 2005. Claims 1 and 4 were amended rendering claims 1-8 are pending. The indicated allowability of claims 1-8 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Werkema et al. (U.S. 4,575,477). Rejections based on the newly cited reference(s) follow.

As indicated in the attached interview held on June 28, 2005, the Final Status of the Office Action mailed June 13, 2005, is withdrawn, placing the case in a Non-Final status.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 does not further limit instant claim 1, as "of at least one gram per square meter (1g/m²) is broader than "one to five grams per square meter (1 to 5 g/m²) rendering claim 3 indefinite.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103(a)

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitamura et al. (U.S. 6,465,086).

Kitamura teaches an ink jet recording material having two coatings, where the inner coat comprises silica (column 2, lines 23-31) and where the first and second coatings are formed on the surface (column 3, lines 17-65 and column 6, lines 10-42). Kitamura discloses the coating layer can be formed by conventional coating means, including a gravure means (column 12, lines 22-26 and column 22, lines 20-22) where the coating material comprises silica and the support is a paper sheet (column 13, lines 41-50). Kitamura discloses the invention being of conventional coated paper sheets (column 20, line 22) where paper sheets conventionally comprise fibrous materials. The reference discloses drying the coated paper (column 13, lines 20-33 and column 25, lines 20-27) and calendering the material (column 25, lines 28-32). Kitamura does not explicitly disclose that the cited inner coat has the deposition amount as instantly claimed. Such deposition amount is a property which can be easily determined by one of ordinary skill in the art. With regard to the limitation of the deposition amount, absent

Art Unit: 1774

a showing of unexpected results, it is obvious to modify the conditions of a composition because they are merely the result of routine experimentation. The experimental modification of prior art in order to optimize operation conditions (e.g. deposition amount) fails to render claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. The aforementioned limitation is optimizable as it directly affects the mechanical strength and durability of the coated paper. As such, it is optimizable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the coated paper with the limitations of the deposition amount of the inner coat since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(b)

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1 and 3-6, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werkema et al. (U.S. 4,575,477).

Werkema discloses a coated paper for gravure printing (column 1, lines 6-8) comprising pigments in the coating, such as precipitated calcium carbonate (column 2, lines 18-25). Werkema further discloses the base paper is multiple coated, where the

Art Unit: 1774

coating weight is above 4.5 grams per square meter (column 5, lines 12-17). Werkema discloses using a coater and where the coating is subjected to conventional procedures for drying and calendaring the paper (column 5, lines 30-52).

Response to Arguments

8. The rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s) is withdrawn due to Applicant canceling the phrases, "the composition of the conventional surface coat does not contain silica" and "the composition of which not containing silica".

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Ferguson whose telephone number is 571-272-1522. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9:00 AM – 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rena Dye, can be reached on 571-272-3186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Art Unit: 1774

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Lawrence Ferguson
Patent Examiner
AU 1774



RENA DYE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

A.U. 1774 1/8/05